DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 297 494 EC 210 345

AUTHOR Burnham, Brian; And Others
TITLE Grade 3 Screening for Admission to Programs for the Gifted. Analyses of the 1984-87 Stage I and Stage II Data.
INSTITUTION York Region Board of Education, Aurora (Ontario).
PUB DATE Sep 87
NOTE 36p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Statistical Data (110)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Ability Identification; Comparative Analysis; *Educational Diagnosis; Foreign Countries; French; *Gifted; Grade 3; Immersion Programs; Predictive Measurement; *Predictive Validity; Primary Education; *Screening Tests; Siblings; Standardized Tests; *Testing Programs
IDENTIFIERS Otis Lennon Mental Ability Test; Raven Progressive Matrices; *York Region Board of Education ON

ABSTRACT

The York Region Board of Education in Ontario, Canada, screens students for giftedness in grade 3. This report analyzes data produced in the 1986-87 screening procedure, involving approximately 3,400 students. The report begins with a review of procedural changes that were designed to make the screening more effective and efficient than earlier study cycles. Then the results of the most recent screening are examined, with the finding that scores on the Otis-Lennon Mental Abilities Test and Raven's Standard Progressive Matrices were better predictors of giftedness than parent or teacher recommendations and better than the testing of siblings of pupils previously identified as gifted. The data analysis reviewed the following specific issues: (1) errors in calculating or recording data; (2) male and female performances on the screening procedures; (3) effectiveness of the screening of French immersion pupils; (4) effectiveness of the screening of pupils with gifted siblings; (5) effectiveness of the Teacher Checklist as an initial screen; and (6) effectiveness of peer nomination as an initial screen. The report concludes with recommendations to further increase the effectiveness and efficiency of the screening procedures. (JDD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED297494

Grade 3 Screening for Admission to Programs for the Gifted

Analyses of the 1984-87 Stage I and Stage II Data

A report for

John Laughlin
Superintendent of Special Education
and Student Support Services

Prepared by

Brian Burnham
Chief Research Officer
Curriculum Division

Assisted by

Daria Lindsey
Testing Officer

Jay McCallum
Chief Psychologist

Anita Townsend
Consultant for the Gifted

September 1987

EC210345

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Brian Burnham

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

The context for the report "Grade 3 screening for admission to programs for the gifted: analyses of the 1984-87 Stage I and Stage II data" (Aurora, Ontario, September 1987)

In Ontario, Canada, school districts are required to provide programming for all special education students and must develop procedures for identifying and then continuously monitoring and evaluating these exceptional pupils, including the intellectually gifted.

"Giftedness," not to be confused with "talented," is defined under the Education Act as "An unusally advanced degree of general intellectual ability that requires differentiated learning experiences...."

The York Region Board of Education, immediately north of Metropolitan Toronto, is Canada's ninth largest school board (55,000 day students). The YRBE screens all students (about 3,300 in 1988) not previously assessed for giftedness in grade 3. Other districts may screen earlier or later and have their own procedures. The common challenge is to find procedures that are effective and efficient.

For over four years the YRBE has monitored and adjusted its procedures. The report "Grade 3 screening for admission to programs for the gifted: analyses of the 1984-87 Stage I and Stage II data" summarizes research findings and operational changes to the two-stage process of identifying gifted grade 3 youngsters.

CONTENTS

Changes resulting from the 1984-85 and 1985-86 studies	1
Analysis of the 1986-87 screening data	3
Effectiveness and efficiency of the screening procedures	5
Errors in calculating and recording data	9
Effectiveness of the screening of FI pupils	12
Effectiveness of the screening pupils who have gifted siblings	15
Effectiveness of the Teacher Checklist as a Stage I screen	16
Effectiveness of Peer Nomination as a Stage I screen	22
Recommendations for future action	26

Tables

1	Indicators of effectiveness and efficiency	7
2	Twin's data	8
3	Inconsistent results that suggest error	9
4	How male and female pupils fare on the scoring procedures	11
5	Gifted program Stage II screening: "French Immersion" pupil study	13
6	Gifted program Stage II screening: "Gifted Sibling" study	17

Distribution of Teacher Checklist raw and weighted scores

7	Area A	19
8	Area D	20
9	Area E	21

Teacher Checklist and Peer Nomination raw and weighted scores

10	Area A	24
11	Area E	25

Appendices

A	Teacher Checklist	28
B	Peer Nomination (Which Two Classmates...?)	29

Grade 3 Screening for Admission to Programs for the Gifted

Analyses of the 1984-87 Stage I and Stage II Data

A B S T R A C T

This report is based upon analyses of data produced in the 1986-87 screening procedure for identifying grade 3 gifted pupils. The report begins with an overview of the results of two earlier study cycles, 1984-85 and 1985-86, which were designed to make the screening procedures more effective and efficient.

Changes resulting from the 1985 and 1986 recommendations are reviewed since they form the basis for analyses conducted in the spring of 1987. The 1984-87 indicators of effec- tiveness and efficiency are presented to show improvements resulting in large part from these changes. The principal subjects of review in 1987 include French Immersion pupils and also those pupils with siblings previously identified (or identified in this year's screening) as gifted. The Raven's Standard Progressive Matrices results and the ratings obtained from the Teachers Checklist and Peer Nomination exercises were scrutinized. Interesting but adventitious data on how gifted twins fared on the screening procedures also are offered.

The 1986-87 results show substantial improvements in the effectiveness and efficiency of the screening procedures. The most significant blocks to even greater improvements appear to be the two rating schemes, probably in their content and also in the way they have been presented to teachers and pupils for use. The screening criterion scores, even though gained by imperfect instruments, proved to be better predictors of giftedness than did the other means by which pupils advanced to the final testing exercise.

Seven recommendations aimed at further increasing the effectiveness and efficiency of the screening procedures are proposed in the conclusion of this report.

Grade 3 Screening for Admission to Programs for the Gifted
Analyses of the 1984-87 Stage I and Stage II Data

Changes resulting from the 1984-85 and 1985-86 studies

Since the 1984-85 school year, the data generated by the two-stage screening procedures has been analysed in the hope of improving the selection process. Analysis began with questions raised during review of the 1984-85 and then the 1985-86 data. The "answers" which these first analyses offered indicated:

(1) that additional data on the pupils or other procedures were needed before all the appropriate analyses could be made;

(2) a need to revise the handbook that guides the administration of the various Stage I screening tests and checklists;

(3) that misunderstandings or errors had crept into the mechanics of Stage I testing and rating;

(4) a need to revise the "cut points," i.e., the Stage I test and rating scale raw scores at which "weighted value scores" are awarded toward selection for Stage II screening;

(5) the appropriateness of certain standardized tests (and not others) as measures of the relevant intellectual traits;

(6) the possible presence of systematic gender bias in Stage I or Stage II standardized testing;

(7) that pupils who were tested late in the Stage II screening may have been penalized, because in the days or weeks before testing, they crossed into the next age demarcation on the WISC-R conversion tables. This appears to have the greatest impact on identifying the older pupils;

On the basis of these analyses, many recommendations for changes in the screening processes were made in 1985 and 1986.

The most significant recommendations for Stage I of the screening were:

(1) the inclusion on class and individual records of data useful in analysing results of the screening, e.g., sex of student, student's date of birth, date student tested, whether student has a gifted sibling, the "base scores," e.g., DIQ, as well as weighted values, and class record sheets were to be examined for compliance with the directions.

(2) the revision of the teachers' handbook ("Guideline") and the development of a workshop that prepares Grade 3 teachers for the testing and rating processes. A close monitoring of the data provided by teachers during this period of change was also recommended;

(3) the raising of the "cut-point" scores i.e., raw scores at which weighted value scores are earned on the OLMAT and RSPM, on the basis of empirical contingency tables constructed from 1984-85 and 1985-86 data;

(4) the stabilization of the criterion weighted values scores at which pupils may proceed to Stage II screening, namely a score of 7 or more, except for French Immersion pupils who do not take the OLMAT and for whom a minimum score of 5 gains admission;

(5) the continuation of the use of the Otis-Lennon Mental Abilities Test (OLMAT) with all candidates except the French Immersion students;

(6) the introduction (1984-85) and then the continuation of the Raven's Standard Progressive Matrices (RSPM) test to complement the OLMAT. It became the sole Stage I standardized test with the French Immersion pupils;

(7) the elimination of the Peer Nomination rating system in 1986-87. However, the decision was to continue use but submit the results for further studies of its effectiveness;

Except as noted, these recommendations were acted upon in 1986-87.

The important recommendations for the Stage II individual assessment process were:

(1) that the psychologists review their procedures for setting pupils at ease when the pupil is of the opposite sex;

(2) that when a pupil is among the last tested (i.e., in April), the impact of the relative lateness of the testing upon the converted score be considered and steps taken (e.g., pro-rating) to obviate the situation which sees a score "slip" from the gifted to the superior range because the testee, by a few days or weeks, has passed an age demarcation on the conversion tables;

(3) that the psychologists clarify the circumstances under which a full-scale WISC-R be given to a pupil whose short-form (DQ) score meets the minimum score requirement for nomination to the programs for the gifted.

These recommendations were acted upon in 1986-87.

Analyses of the 1986-87 Screening Data

The 1986-87 Stage I and Stage II data were reviewed for a variety of reasons related to previous findings and changes introduced in 1986-87.

There were eight review activities, seven planned plus one (#6) which was introduced in light of the results of review activity #5.

(1) An examination of each Class Record Sheet was made to determine whether discernable errors had been made and to correct them so that the Stage I data was as "clean" as it could be without actually rescoring every test and rating activity.

(2) An analysis of Stage I data for male and female pupils was made to determine whether there was a disproportionate number of boys or girls put forward for Stage II screening and also whether Stage II assessment produced a disproportionate number of boys nominated for gifted programs.

(3) A listing of the performance of French Immersion (FI) pupils who proceeded to Stage II screening was prepared. It contained an indication of which pupils had not attained the criterion weighted score, and how they fared in comparison to those who had met the criterion, plus other data that might suggest how to improve the selection process for FI pupils.

(4) A similar array of the performance data of pupils with siblings admitted to programs for the gifted was prepared, again with an indication of which students had not met the criterion weighted score, plus other data for exploration.

(5) A graphic analysis of a sample containing 53% of all pupils in the Stage II process was prepared in order to show how Teacher Checklist scores fared as predictors of admission to the programs for the gifted.

(6) Based on what was found from analysis #5, a supplementary analysis, using data on all Stage I participants from three administrative areas (A, D and E), was conducted of Teacher Checklist ratings and their relationship to nominations for gifted program admission.

(7) Peer Nomination (PN) raw scores were included in the data displays accompanying the three reviews noted above. They were examined for indications of "improved" usage of this rating scale. Then, PN and TC scores were combined in contingency tables for two of the areas to show how well these ratings, taken together, predicted giftedness.

(8) The various data elements that reflected the outcomes of Stage I and Stage II screening in 1986-87 were compared with those from previous years in order to see whether our current screening procedures appear to be more efficient and effective than those of recent years.

It is with the last analysis that we begin in the next section to report what we found from the data. This section also reviews objectives of the annual studies and summarizes progress over the three years.

Effectiveness and Efficiency of the Screening Procedures (Review activity #8)

By 1984-85, there was a concern that the Board's two-stage procedures for identifying gifted Grade 3 pupils were less efficient than they could be. About one in eight (12.3%) of the grade cohort were being recommended for Stage II assessment. At Stage II many more pupils were being identified as non-gifted than gifted. The ratio varied across the Region, but for several years averaged about 2:1. To the costs of this inefficiency in staff, pupil and parent time must be added the loss of self-esteem by some pupils and their parents whose hopes were raised then dashed by the lack of identifi- cation .

Research efforts for 1984-85 and 1985-86 were focused on determining the effectiveness of the Stage I standardized tests and on trying out alternatives. The 1985-86 analyses found that the higher Otis-Lennon Mental Abilities Test (OLMAT) and Raven's Standard Progress Matrices (RSPM) scores contributed significantly to prediction of giftedness. But lower scores, by themselves, were indifferent predictors. There were indications of some poor test administration, scoring, and recording of results. In 1986 the teachers' handbook was revised. Workshops were held to prepare classroom teachers to administer correctly and score accurately the standardized tests. Teachers were also shown how to use the rating systems specifically for the Teacher Checklist and Peer Nomination, how to derive weighted scores from all four devices, and how to calculate a total weighted Stage I screening score.

If a total weighted value of at least 7, or 5 if in French Immersion as these pupils do not take the OLMAT, is attained, a pupil proceeds to Stage II screening. This stage consists of an individually administered Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children-Revised (WISC-R).

In 1984-85, it was thought that if the effectiveness of Stage I screening were increased, the "inefficiency ratio" (non-gifted:gifted) should move from the prevailing ratio of about 2:1 toward 1:1*. The number of pupils (as a

---

* That is, it is acceptable that some superior students would be identified as possibly gifted, but might fall slightly short of the criterion score on the Stage II test. A ratio of one non-gifted to one gifted student after effective screening was however only a target based on considered opinions about a tolerable level of "inefficiency."

percentage of the grade cohort) put forward for Stage II would thus decrease, assuming that the percentage of gifted pupils remained stable.

In the first year (1985-86) that the findings were put to use, results were promising:

(1) 34% of those screened at Stage II were found to be gifted (inefficiency ratio = 2:1), about four percentage points better than the average of the previous two years;

(2) fewer full-scale WISC-R assessments were required (i.e., there were fewer borderline cases) except in Area 4 where demographic changes were substantial;

(3) at least 12 fewer person-days were required for psychologists to conduct the Stage II screening, there being 39 fewer students to assess even though the grade cohort was larger by more than 100 students;

(4) by-sex screening results were provided that could help psychologists appreciate the need to look into their administration procedures for possible sources of bias in individual testing, if such existed;

(5) specifications were prepared for data collection in 1986-87 that could help address questions about gender bias and about the effectiveness of the Teacher Checklist and Peer Nomination procedures;

(6) "cut point" scores were identified for assigning weights on the Stage I tests to increase efficiency while, by permitting recommendations "for other reasons," ensured that factors other than test scores were considered.

The 1986-87 data indicate even greater effectiveness in the Stage I screening processes and resulting efficiencies for Stage II screening:

(1) the previous small reduction in the inefficiency ratio was not only retained, but substantially greater gains were realized. The ratio is now 14:11, i.e., approaching 1:1, as Table 1, which follows, shows;

(2) although the 1986-87 total Grade 3 pupil cohort increased 12.3% compared with the previous year, the number of pupils assessed at Stage II rose only 10.7%;

(3) the number of pupils found to be not gifted dropped significantly (over 6%) compared to 1986 and the number of identified as gifted rose 44%, a dramatic increase even when the Grade 3 population growth rate (12%) is taken into account.

Table 1: Indicators of Effectiveness and Efficiency

	March Roll*	Tested Stage II	% of pop. tested	Non-gifted	Gifted**
1984	2955	362	12.3	234	128
1985	3069	339	11.0	226	112
1986	3126	300	9.6	198	102
1987	3512	332	9.5	185	147
Change(%)					
1986-87	+12.3	+10.7	-1.5	-6.6	+44.1

* Pupils in full time special education programs are not screened.
** Does not include Grade 3 pupils previously identified as gifted.

There are several ways to consider the efficiencies resulting in large part if not exclusively from recent changes in screening practices. Using 1984 as a base, the Grade 3 cohort has grown about 19 per cent, but the number of students proceeding to Stage II screening has declined by 8 per cent and the number identified as non-gifted has fallen 21 per cent. The number identified as gifted has risen to about 4.3 per cent from just over 4.0 per cent. These figures indicate the payoffs that greater effectiveness produces.

However, certain threats to effectiveness were found in the 1986-87 data from the schools:

(1) there were mechanical errors by a number of teachers in reckoning or recording the Teacher Checklist raw scores;

(2) there were great variations in the application of both rating scales and especially in awarding weighted values to the raw scores;

(3) revisions in the cut-point scores apparently eliminated some marginal candidates for Stage II screening, but there were many pupils put forward on the basis of considerations other than the criterion score and these reasons proved to be less reliable predictors of giftedness.

Later, the 1986-87 data on French Immersion pupils and also those with gifted siblings will be used to show that recommendations for Stage II assessment that arise from meeting the Stage I criterion score were better predictors of giftedness than were the other means by which some pupils proceeded to Stage II testing. These other means were (1) parent or teacher recommendation of pupils who did not meet the Stage I criterion scores, and (2) testing the Grade 3 siblings of pupils previously admitted into the programs for the gifted, even if they did not meet the Stage I criterion score.

An unplanned and informal exploration was made of the standardardized tests (Otis-Lennon MAT, Raven's SPM) results for twins. The 1986-87 data on twins identified in the Stage II screening indicated that the scores attained by each twin of a pair, whether identical or fraternal, resembled each other closely. Teacher Checklist and Peer Nomination raw scores also were very similar, as the table below shows. These findings suggest reliability in the instruments used, but there are only three sets of data. It is recommended that data on twins continue to be collected and pooled overtime.

Table 2: Twins' Data

		Measurement Instrument				
		OLMAT	RSPM	TC	PN	WISC-R
Set A	M	139	40	21	7	149
	F	135	42	23	8	140
Set B	M_1	134	41	19	37	135
	M_2	134	39	12	40	134
Set C	M_1	(Not taken;	42	19	19	135
	M_2	FI students)	40	24	17	134

M = Male F = Female

Errors in calculating or recording data (Review activity #1)

The review of the Class Record Sheets revealed mechanical errors, e.g., values that could not be correct, such as a Teacher Checklist raw score greater than 32. Correct data were substituted where possible and necessary by recalculating or by contacting the teacher to obtain the source documents.

Some mechanical errors cannot be readily detected by examination of The Class Record Sheets, e.g., a reversal in birthdate, 12/11/78 instead of 11/12/78. While that example may not create a problem, the reversal within an OLMAT raw score might, e.g., a 123 recorded as 132 and a higher weighted score consequently assigned. We cannot determine, though we suspect, that errors in reckoning and reporting testing or rating scale scores are the causes for the relatively small number of inconsistent sets of scores found during the review. Below are examples of possible errors of this sort drawn from the data sheets for students in five different schools. Each pupil was close to the criterion weighted value (WV). If the error worked against the pupil, the child undeservedly missed the opportunity to proceed to Stage II screening.

Table 3: Inconsistent results that suggest error

	OLMAT (W)	RSPM (W)	TC(W)	PN(W)	WS
1	140(3)	43(1)	23(1)	11(0)	6
2	142(3)	32(0)	23(2)	15(1)	6
3	116(0)	42(1)	21(2)	30(2)	5
4	97(0)	44(2)	15(2)	8(1)	5
5	130(2)	24(0)	29(2)	24(2)	6

There are possibilities other than errors suggested by these data -- notably inconsistency in Teacher Checklist or Peer Nomination weights. Such possibilities are explored later in this report.

Do such inconsistencies indicate errors? In any event, there are enough clear cases of failure to record some data or to make conversions from raw scores that action should be taken to reduce if not totally eliminate such avoidable errors. Simplifying the rating tasks, as recommended on the basis of these analyses, may help teachers avoid mechanical errors. Recommendations, given later in this report, address this matter.

Male and female performances on the screening procedures (Review activity #2)

In 1985-86 the data indicated that a few more boys than girls were proceeding from Stage I screening to Stage II. After the administration of the WISC-R, even more boys than girls were nominated for the programs for the gifted. Three lines of action were thus initiated in 1986-87:

(1) The Chief Psychologist consulted the literature and the technical data on the WISC-R to determine what was known about boys' and girls' test performance;

(2) the psychologists were briefed on the gender differences on the WISC-R and made aware that some young girls may be apprehensive when alone with an "unknown" adult male;

(3) the collection of appropriate data for an exploratory analysis of by-sex performance was arranged for the 1986-87 screening programs. The objective was to use the 1985-86 data as a baseline for monitoring for "gender differences." The 1986-87 screening would serve for discovering problems in collecting appropriate data and for determining the possible extent of differences after steps had been taken to guard against it.

Difficulty in pursuing these inquiries were found with data sources. Principals' "September Reports" provide by-sex, by-grade enrolment. Subsequent monthly reports, including those for the screening months, do not. Therefore, the two data are only close approximations of appropriate by-sex enrolment figures.

We manually retrieved the September 1985 and 1986 total by-sex enrolment figures for Grade 3 excluding Special Education students. The by-sex student data for March 1987 were retrieved from the data sheets and new record cards developed for the 1986-87 screening.

Table 4 outlines the results. "Rec. at Stage I" refers to pupils who met the weighted score criterion plus those recommended for Stage II or assessed because they have gifted siblings. The figures in brackets represent all these pupils as a percentage of the September enrolment (not including Special Education pupils). The column headed "Nom. at Stage II" shows the numbers of boys and girls who met the criterion WISC-R score. In brackets are shown how these figures stand as a percentage of those recommended from Stage I. The two-year summary indicates that the total numbers of boys and girls in the processes are almost exactly equal over the period. Three boys were nominated for the gifted program for every two girls so identified.

Table 4: How male and female pupils fare on the screening procedures for Gifted Programs, 1985-87

School Year	September Enrolment M	F	Rec. at Stage I M	F	Nom. at Stage II M	F
1985-86	1509	1552	156(10.3)	144(9.3)	65(42)	37(26)
1986-87	1752	1705	174(9.9)	158(9.3)	87(50)	60(38)
Totals	3261	3257	330(10.1)	302(9.3)	152(47)	97(32)

Girls fare less well than boys on both stages of the screening procedure. This is consistent with what was found from the literature on the WISC-R as a measure of intelligence. The results may be psychometrically sound even if not "socially acceptable," just as there is difficulty in accepting that significantly more boys than girls are identified for remedial programs.

How can we use this information other than accepting the results as a necessary artifact of the distribution of intelligence? Do we wish to develop a plan for collection of more exact data for 1987-88? Is it worthwhile looking at by-sex performance on the Stage I tests and ratings of those who made the criterion score and, separately, of those who proceeded to Stage II on other bases? Is age a factor that may be interacting with sex? Do we wish to examine comparatively the OLMAT, RSPM, or WISC-R performance of boys and girls at selected age intervals?

Is it premature to conclude that there is a gender difference in the screening procedures, although our present data suggest this phenomenon and the literature points to gender differences in brain development? Sex may be a differentiating factor, but other factors e.g., age, the socialization processes for boys and girls may interact with it in ways that we do not yet understand.

Effectiveness of the screening of FI pupils (Review activity #3)

After 1984-85, the use of the OLMAT was discontinued with the French Immersion cohort as it is a difficult, even unfair, test for all but the superior pupil whose English reading skills have developed independent of instruction at school. A study in 1985-86 showed the RSPM, introduced originally to supplement the OLMAT, to be a good predictor of superior intellectual status at the higher score ranges (40 and above). In 1986-87 the question was whether the Stage I screening basis was now too narrow, especially if the Teacher Checklist and Peer Nomination rating schemes were somewhat ineffective. The rating exercises are explored later in this report.

The 1986-87 review examined the RSPM and WISC-R results of the 58 Grade 3 FI pupils who proceeded to Stage II testing. Of these, 17 (29%) had not attained the minimum weighted value score of 5 normally required to try the WISC-R test. These 17 were mainly assessed either because of a gifted sibling (ten instances) or a parent request (five instances). Teachers were free to request that other pupils be considered for Stage II testing, but only one did so, apparently on the basis of high RSPM scores. Of the 17, only six, all boys, met the WISC-R criterion measure.

Of the 57 pupils for whom we have Raven's scores (RS on Table 5, page 13-14), all except six had scores of 40 or greater. Of this low-scoring six, only one (17%) was found to be gifted. That pupil had a Raven's score of 39. By comparison, we find the following results at higher RSPM score groups:

RSPM Score	No. Pupils	No. Gifted (%)
40	6	1 (17)
40-44	18	13 (72)
45-49	22	15 (68)
49	11	5 (45)

Table 5

Gifted Program Stage II Screening: "French Immersion" pupil study

Summary of Pupil Performance

	School Code	Init.	DoB M/D/Y	DoT M/D	Stage 1 Scores TC	PN	RS	WISC-R DQ scores Males (34) Yes	Males (34) No	Females (24) Yes	Females (24) No
1	10	AK	10/28/78	3/11	25	41	39		117		
2	10	KW	7/15/79	3/11	20	1	[b]	140			
3	20	TJ	5/04/78	4/07	21	18	45	138			
4	20	CA	12/13/77	4/07	23	3	48	137			
5	20	AM	1/09/78	4/06	23	21	47	132			
6	20	IB	7/25/78	4/06	14	9	50	131			
7	20	TB	1/30/78	4/06	31	25	47	134			
8	20	JS	1/21/78	4/08	16	4	43	126			
9	20	LW	6/27/78	4/07	23	21	39				118
10	20	SR	8/09/78	4/07	23	21	38		121		
11	20	NB	1/ [b]/78	4/06	25	11	50				113
12	30	JT	5/20/78	3/30	23	13	44	133			
13	30	DD	10/16/78	3/26	28	26	41	131			
14	30	DP	12/21/78	3/26	21	16	45	134			
15	30	IH	12/13/77	3/27	23	15	41	136			
16	30	JN	4/23/78	3/27	11	0	40		112*		
17	30	CW	8/09/78	3/27	18	14	43		113		
18	30	BB	4/18/78	3/26	9	6	47				122*
19	30	SW	10/11/78	3/26	22	11	46				117
20	30	JH	6/16/78	3/31	23	9	53	146			
21	30	LS	7/11/78	3/31	7	2	47				112*
22	30	AS	7/21/78	3/26	29	11	49			130	
23	30	PV	12/31/78	3/02	16	5	46	142			
24	31	BG	1/09/78	3/10	12	(1)[a]	50		124*		
25	31	SL	4/29/78	3/09	17	(2)[a]	48			133	
26	31	EP	2/22/78	3/10	29	(2)[a]	44	133			
27	31	AS	7/13/78	3/10	19	(2)[a]	41			138	
28	31	DC	10/22/78	3/09	8	0	52		129*		
29	31	JG	8/25/78	4/14	0	0	50				125*
30	31	SA	10/12/77	4/22	14	[b]	39				110*
31	31	TS	11/29/78	4/14	[b]	[b]	52				130
32	40	JD	2/16/78	3/30	22	15	45		122		
33	40	KD	10/15/78	3/30	40	26	47	130			
34	40	AL	2/09/78	3/30	(1)[a]	(2)[a]	(3)[a]			136	
35	40	JB	1/29/78	3/30	15	9	40				124*
36	40	DK	6/16/78	4/01	26	34	44				107
37	40	AM	1/27/78	4/01	16	17	43	142*			
38	40	JG	1/20/78	4/01	13	2	43	140*			
39	40	AB	12/20/78	4/01	19	21	39	138*			

(continued)

	School Code	Init.	DoB M/D/Y	DoT M/D	Stage 1 Scores TC	PN	RS	WISC-R DQ scores Males (34) Yes	Males (34) No	Females (24) Yes	Females (24) No
40	50	CH	11/15/78	4/13	24	6	49				110
41	50	KJ	9/16/78	4/13	18	4	45				120*
42	50	JJ	10/28/78	4/13	28	29	42	130			
43	50	LA	6/30/78	4/10	25	12	48			139	
44	50	EC	2/03/78	4/10	28	53	44				116
45	50	HL	9/15/78	4/10 4/13	24	12	46	140			
46	50	FL	12/29/78	4/13	20	7	48				121*
47	50	JG	12/01/78	4/22	16	9	47	142*			
48	50	SS	1/17/78	4/22	23	24	47	131			
49	50	MN	4/24/78	4/22	13	16	52	146			
50	50	CW	8/03/78	4/24	14	14	48			130	
51	50	HO	1/07/78	4/22	26	20	41			131	
52	50	AK	4/21/78	4/24	11	4	36				133*
53	60	AA	5/11/78	4/04	22	10	50		109		
54	60	CC	11/23/78	4/04	19	19	42	135			
55	60	NC	11/23/78	4/04	24	17	40	134*			
56	60	KN	5/15/78	4/04	22	17	49				121
57	60	SP	8/02/78	3/11	21	18	52			136	
58	60	ND	10/05/78	3/11	20	0	47	142*			
		TOTALS						26	8	8	16

[a] Raw scores not provided: Weighted Scores are shown in brackets

[b] Data not provided

* Weighted score did not qualify, but assessed becuase of parent request or gifted sibling

The WISC-R "short form" or DQ scores are shown in this table. The short form consists of five subtests: Information, Similarities, Vocabulary, Picture Arrangement and Block Design. All pupils begin with the short form and this provides a common measure. Pupils obtaining a sum of the five scaled scores between 71 to 77 receive a full administration of the WISC-R. This borderline range contains both gifted and non-gifted pupils. An IQ 132 or greater is required to be designated gifted.

The results for the pupils who scored 50 or higher on the RSPM may be misleading. Two of the pupils, both in the same class, did not receive the necessary five score but were recommended by the teacher. The presence in that one class of three students (another was the sibling of a gifted pupil) scoring 50 or higher is considerably beyond expectation. All three fell short of the WISC-R criterion score. There are indications in the results for this class that there may have been errors in test administration as well as the patent errors in recording data.

It would appear that the RSPM has good predictive power wherever a RSPM score is associated with a relatively high teacher or peer rating. The higher the Raven's score the more likely the FI pupil is to be gifted as measured by the WISC-R. The relationship seems to hold for scores beyond 40 with the possible but unlikely exception of scores beyond 50. However, as can be seen, perhaps one in three of those scoring relatively high on the Raven's is not found to be gifted. In a considerable number of these cases, the teachers or classmates suspected as much, as shown by the TC and PN scores.

Effectiveness of the screening with pupils who have gifted siblings (Review activity #4)

Where a pupil is known to have a gifted sibling, the pupil moves to Stage II whether or not he or she has attained the Stage I weighted value criterion score. Some 37 pupils with gifted brothers or sisters were assessed in 1986-87. Of these, 27 would have been assessed under the normal process.

Of those 10 assessed solely on the grounds of giftedness identified in siblings, two of four boys and one of six girls made the WISC-R criterion score. This compares with 14 of 19 boys and four of eight girls who met the criterion score for admission to Stage II. The respective ineffeciency ratios are 7:3 and 1:2. That is, Stage I screening is highly effective compared to the provision made for siblings of the gifted. However, a case can be made for continuing and refining this provision inasmuch as 30 per cent of the 10 pupils who would otherwise not have gone to Stage II were found to be gifted. In 1985 only 33 per cent of all pupils who were assessed at Stage II proved to be gifted.

Of the nine FI pupils in this sub-population, only three failed to meet the WISC-R criterion score. Each of the three had a record of relatively low teacher and peer ratings, including the girl with the very high (52) Raven's score. We met her earlier and we can note again that she scored a very respectable DQ of 129, the highest score short of a trial on the full-scale WISC-R.

In a mini-report presented earlier to the Chief Psychologist, a more detailed analysis of the 13 non-FI pupils not recommended was rendered. In summary, the following points should be given further thought.

(1) The advisability of administering the WISC-R to pupils with "low" RSPM scores regardless of teacher and peer ratings can be challenged, but probably not with pupils with gifted siblings. Three of four children (pupils #12, 18, 24, 30, Table 6) who appeared to be very poor risks scored in the superior range on the WISC-R.

(2) Three female candidates (#9, 10, 32) with OLMAT scores ranging from 130 to 145 "dropped" substantially on the WISC-R (20, 23 and 18 points respectively). Only boys showed higher WISC-R than OLMAT scores and no boy "dropped" more than 10 points. Are gender differences at work here?

Table 6 provides summary data.

Effectiveness of the Teacher Checklist as a Stage I Screen (Review activities #5 and #6)

The Teacher Checklist was identified in 1985-86 as lacking in good predictive power. In the 1986-87 workshops, efforts were made to ensure that teachers knew how to use this rating scheme.

The 1986-87 results were subjected to two rounds of analysis. Only one was originally planned in the vain belief that the training workshops would lead to consistent and useful TC ratings.

Table 6

Gifted Program Stage II Screening: "Gifted Sibling" study

Summary of Pupil Performance

	School Code	Init.	DoB M/D/Y	DoT M/D	Stage 1 Scores OL	TC	PN	RS	WISC-R DQ scores Males (23) Yes	Males (23) No	Females (14) Yes	Females (14) No
1	21	AS	3/15/78	3/27	123	24	10	41			133	
2	21	SB	17/05/78	3/30	150+	31	24	49	151			
3	22	RB	4/20/78	3/24	116	16	4	53	133			
4	31 FI	DS	10/22/78	3/09	-	8	0	52		129*		
5	32	SC	12/17/78	3/04	139	21	7	40	149			
6	32	HC	12/17/78	3/04	135	23	8	42			140	
7	33	RC	6/18/78	3/24	136	30	17	42	142			
8	33	KC	2/01/79	3/24	120	28	9	39	138*			
9	34	MR	2/08/78	3/23	136	27	9	49				116
10	35	AR	4/08/78	3/23	145	20	14	46				122
11	35	TY	4/10/78	3/24	133	17	21	41		123		
12	36	JV	6/29/78	4/22	110	26	16	37		130*		
13	40 FI	AL	2/09/78	3/30	-	(1)[a]	(2)[a]	(3)[a]			136	
14	40 FI	JB	1/29/78	3/30	-	15	9	40				124*
15	40 FI	JG	1/20/78	4/01	-	13	2	43	140*			
16	40 FI	AB	12/20/78	4/01	-	19	21	39	138			
17	41	PP	8/21/78	4/06	140	13	25	36	149			
18	51	JG	9/11/78	3/26	122	30	5	19				117*
19	51	SA	11/23/78	3/31 4/02	137	19	7	45	133			
20	52	JP	22/05/78	3/11	145	32	17	43	146			
21	53	RA	3/08/78	4/09	143	19	6	36	135			
22	53	MT	2/01/78	4/09	134	19	37	41	135			
23	53	JT	2/01/78	4/03	134	12	40	39	134			
24	54	NW	3/04/78	3/12	120	19	7	49		129		
25	55	NA	11/06/78	4/09 4/30	127	30	17	29		120		
26	56	AA	5/08/78	3/06	131	27	14	37				122
27	56	JM	9/23/78	3/09	129	27	13	25		122		
28	57	JF	2/23/78	3/24	133	8	7	43			134*	
29	50 FI	JJ	10/28/78	4/13	-	28	29	42	130			
30	50 FI	AK	4/21/78	4/24	-	11	4	36				133[b]*
31	61	MK	4/22/78	3/05	134	28	9	49				129
32	61	RM	7/16/78	3/06	143	20	4	36				125*
33	60 FI	CC	11/23/78	3/04	-	19	19	42	135			
34	60 FI	NC	11/23/78	3/04	-	24	17	40	134			
35	62	ML	9/28/78	4/08	130	19	7	37				121*
36	62	SC	1/20/78	4/10	134	27	30	47		124		
37	63	GD	3/29/78	3/09	134	11	17	42			133	
							TOTALS		16	7	5	9

[a] Raw scores not provided: Weighted scores are shown in brackets

[b] Full-scale WISC-R = 126

* Did not attain a qualifying Weighted score

Round one consisted of graphically plotting the Teacher Checklist raw scores for a 50 per cent sample (actually, 176 of 332) of all pupils who proceeded to Stage II. Two curves were developed, one for those 76 pupils who met the WISC-R criterion and one for those 100 pupils who didn't. The only significant difference between the curves was to be found where TC scores were below 19. Even there, we find that pupils not recommended scored below 20, but so did 27 per cent of those who met the Stage II criterion. Thereafter, a TC rating had little predictive value beyond saying that between 40 and 50 per cent of those scoring 20 to 32 (the maximum) would meet the Stage II criterion. A pupil scoring at the interval 28-32, was as likely to be found not gifted as gifted.

This unexpected finding called for further exploration. Round two was structured to look at the Teacher Checklist scores across the whole Grade 3 cohort, including pupils who did not proceed to Stage II screening. Results for Areas A, D, E were compiled: this sample covers a range of York Region communities and about 45 per cent of the Grade 3 pupil population.

To Tables 7, 8, and 9 have been added notes on the particulars relevant to the results for each area. What collectively do these summaries show about the Teacher Checklist?

These summaries and the class records that lie behind them perhaps tell us more about teachers and how they respond to subjective rating scales than they tell us about pupils. From class records we find TC raw scores of very small ranges (0 to 8, for example) where a score as low as 4 might be given a weighted value of 1 (two cases) and classes with ranges from 0 to 32 where a TC score of 24 receives a weighted value of 0 (three cases). Across this sample, a TC score of 18 would earn a weighted value of "0" about 54 per cent of the time, a value of "1" 34 per cent of the time, and a value of "2" 12 per cent of the time.

Only in Area D does there seem to be a fairly clear demarcation zone between value-gaining scores, and even then TC scores in the 13-16 range might garner any one of the three possible values.

Table 7: Distribution of Teacher Checklist raw scores and weight assigned to each score - Area A

TC raw scores	0			1			2			Totals per score
	M	F	T	M	F	T	M	F	T	
0	9	10	19							19
1	5	13	18							18
2	8	9	17							17
3	7	15	22							22
4	7	8	15							15
5	10	10	20							20
6	11	7	18	4		4				22
7	8	12	20	1	1	2				22
8	7	4	11		1	1				12
9	6	7	13	7		7				20
10	10	1	11	2	1	3				14
11	4	6	10	1		1				11
12	5	8	13		1	1	1		1	15
13	7	4	11	1		1				12
14	2	5	7		3	3	1		1	11
15	2	5	7	2		2	3		3	12
16	4	1	5		1	1				6
17	2	4	6	1		1	1	1	2	9
18	5	5	10		1(1)	1		1(1)	1	12(2)
19	5	3	8	1		1	1	2(2)	3	12(2)
20	3	2	5		3	3	1		1	9
21		1	1	3	7	10	1		1	12
22		1	1	2	5	7	1		1	9
23		1	1	4	2	6		1	1	8
24				6	4	10		2	2	12
25				3		3	3(2)	1	4	7(2)
26				5	2	7	3	4	7	14
27					1	1	2(2)	4(2)	6	7(4)
28							1	3(1)	4	4(1)
29							2	4(1)	6	6(1)
30							1(1)	3(1)	4	4(2)
31							4(2)	3(1)	7	7(3)
32							1		1	1
TOTALS	127	142	269	43	33(1)	76	27(7)	29(9)	56	*401(17)

*No TC scores available for eight other students and no records for 27 others (possibly transfers).

Figures in brackets indicate the numbers that were recommended to Stage II screening on the basis of weighted scores of at least 7 (or 5, in the case of FI students). Total recommended for Stage II screening = 20; of these, total nominated for the gifted program = 6. Nine students (including 1 from FI) who had not attained weighted scores of 7 or greater (5 or more if FI) were assessed at Stage II. Only 2 (22%) were subsequently nominated for the gifted program (4 of 11 or 36% of those who met the Stage I criterion score were nominated).

Table 8: Distribution of teacher checklist raw scores and weight assigned to each score - Area D

TC raw scores	0			1			2			Totals per score
	M	F	T	M	F	T	M	F	T	
0	20	17	37							37
1	8(1)	5	13(1)							13(1)
2	9	5	14							14
3	7	11	18							18
4	6(1)	6	12(1)							12(1)
5	11	7	18							18
6	10	8	18							18
7	8	5	13	0	1(1)	1(1)				14(1)
8	3	5	8	3	0	3				11
9	4	8	12	3	0	3				15
10	1	9	10	1	2	3				13
11	1	3	4	0	5	5				9
12	4	2	6	1	0	1				7
13	6	2	8	2	2	4	1(1)	0	1(1)	13(1)
14	3	4	7	0	0	0	1	1(1)	2(1)	9(1)
15	4	2	6	3	2	5	0	1(1)	1(1)	12(1)
16	0	3	3	3	5	8	0	1	1	12
17	2	4	6	5	4	9				15
18	1	0	1	1	2	3				4
19				7	3	10				10
20				4	4	8	5(2)	1	6(2)	14(2)
21				0	2	2	0	4(1)	4(1)	6(1)
22				0	1	1	3(1)	1	4(1)	5(1)
23				1	1	2	0	4(1)	4(1)	6(1)
24				0	2	2	3(2)	1	4(2)	6(2)
25							2(1)	2(1)	4(2)	4(2)
26				0	1(1)	1(1)	6(3)	2(1)	8(4)	9(5)
27							3(1)	3(2)	6(3)	6(3)
28							3(1)	5(3)	8(4)	8(4)
29							0	1(1)	1(1)	1(1)
30							1	0	1	1
31										
32										
TOTALS	108(2)	106	214(2)	34	37(2)	71(2)	28(12)	27(12)	55(24)	*340(28)

* No TC scores available for one school: none of its students proceeded to Stage II. Three students did not meet the Stage I criterion and for whom there is no record of recommendation were nonetheless assessed at Stage II.

Figures in brackets indicate the numbers that were recommended to Stage II screening, 19 on the basis of weighted scores of at least 7 (or 5 in the case of FI students) or because of a gifted sibling (2 cases) or because of teacher recommendation (9 students), or because of parent request (2 cases). Of the 19 who met the criterion weighted score, 10 (53%) were found to be gifted; of the 12 who did not meet the criterion, 6 (50%) were gifted, including the two who were assessed because of parental request. Of the five students with gifted siblings, 2 of the 3 who met the Stage 1 criterion were found to be gifted; of the other 2, 1 was identified as gifted at Stage II. In summary, 16 or 31 (52%) assessed at Stage II were found to be gifted.

Table 9: Distribution of teacher checklist raw scores and weight assigned to each score - Area E

TC raw scores	0			1			2			Totals per score
	M	F	T	M	F	T	M	F	T	
0	11	11	22							22
1	19	13	32							32
2	13	17	30							30
3	16	14	30							30
4	13	18	31	1		1	1		1	33
5	11	18	29							29
6	13	17	30		1	1				31
7	20	17	37				1		1	38
8	13	10	23	1		1				24
9	12	12	24	1	1	2				26
10	11	7	18		2	2				20
11	6	11	17	3	3	6				23
12	7	9	16	2	4	6				22
13	6	6	12	4(1)	7	11	1		1	24 (1)
14	10	8	18	2	2(1)	4	1	1(1)	2	24 (2)
15	9	11	20	1	5	6	1(1)	1	2	28 (1)
16	2	8	10	7	1	8	1(1)		1	19 (1)
17	9	1	10	3	4(1)	7				17 (1)
18	7	4	11	2	8	10	3(2)	1(1)	4	25 (3)
19	3	3	6	2	4	6	7(2)		7	19 (2)
20	3		3	10	6	16	1	2	3	22
21	3	2	5	1	3	4	2(1)	3(1)	5	14 (2)
22				3	1	4	2(1)	1(1)	3	7 (2)
23	3	1	4	2	4	6	3(1)	3(2)	6	16 (3)
24	2	1	3	3	2	5	10(2)	5(3)	15	23 (5)
25					1	1	9(1)	5(3)	14	15 (4)
26					1	1	4(2)	7(1)	11	12 (3)
27							6(2)	4(1)	10	10 (3)
28					3	3	7(6)	1(1)	8	11 (7)
29				1	1(1)	2	4(1)	6(4)	10	12 (6)
30							3(1)	1	4	4 (1)
31							3(1)	1(1)	4	4 (2)
32							3(3)	5(4)	8	8 (7)
TOTALS	222	219	441	49(1)	64(3)	113	73(28)	47(24)	120	*674(56)

*No records for 25 students: they may be transfers during the screening periods.

Figures in brackets indicate the numbers that were recommended to Stage II screening on the basis of weighted scores of at least 7 (or 5, in the case of FI students). Total recommended for Stage II screening = 83; of these, total nominated for the gifted program = 41. Thirty-four students (including 2 from FI) who had not attained weighted scores of 7 or greater (5 or more if FI) were tested at Stage 2. Only 10 (29%) were subsequently nominated for the gifted program (31 of 49 or 63% of those who met the Stage 1 criterion score were nominated).

In the light of such results, it was decided to look again at the Teacher Checklist exercise. It seems in retrospect that the exercise provided too much room for teacher interpretation with its resultant range of scores. This may have permitted full rein to some teachers' natural tendencies to mark "generously" or at the other extreme. The translation of the scores into weighted values also appeared to be so unstructured as to permit the great differences that occurred. Moreover, the 16 items used in the exercise seemed to be unduly weighted or biased toward certain of the four characteristics that the teacher was asked to look for in the pupils. Finally, it seemed that the rating could be simplified (and errors reduced) by having the teacher deal with each trait on a basis of consistently present/not present in the pupil and to make only one judgment per item. The resulting score range is reduced thereby (from 0-32 to 0-16) and so is the mathematics required to calculate the score.

After considerable consultation among the four members of the team (Daria Lindsey, Anita Townsend, Jay McCallum, Brian Burnham) revised the handbook, and decided to make substantial changes in the TC. The "Guideline for Teachers and Principals," Identification of Gifted Pupils, 1987, shows these changes in the items, the scoring, and the translation of scores to weighted values by a formula that still permits some subjective input by the teacher. The recommended Teacher Checklist form is appended to this report. It shows, even without the directions that appear in the guideline, that the teachers' task begins with subjective evaluation but the only mechanical activity involved in getting a TC raw score total is checking off items and then counting the checks.

Effectiveness of Peer Nomination as a Stage I screen (Review activity #7)

Based on earlier analyses, it was recommended that the Peer Nomination rating exercise be dropped from the 1986-87 screening program. It was felt that the PN did not add enough to the predictive power of Stage I screening to justify the time that it took. For several reasons it was decided to retain this rating scheme and hope that through the teacher workshops, better results would be found in the 1986-87 program.

The review used data from the two administrative areas most unlike each other, A and E, each somewhat at the "extremes" of the region. They greatly differ in the number of pupils each produced for Stage II testing.

Area A's data for Teacher Checklist and Peer Nomination ratings for the 20 area pupils assessed at Stage II appear as Table 10. The small number of cases permitted quick examination and produced encouraging results. The combination of very high TC scores (30-32) and relatively high PN scores produced four of the six pupils who met the WISC-R criterion score. A fifth pupil had a high TC score (29) and relatively high PN score (14) for his class. The sixth pupil looked at first to be hard to account for (TC = 20; PN = 1) but turned out to be a double-promotion pupil new to his class. While nine other pupils who had weighted value scores of two on each of the rating schemes missed at Stage II, the distribution pattern corresponded to what we might hope for from effective rating schemes when both scales are combined. Moreover seven of this nine had not met the Stage I criterion score.

When the Area E data (83 pupils) were arrayed, a very different and unsatisfactory picture developed. See Table 11. Note that almost any combination of TC and PN raw scores (from 8:7) or weighted values (from 0:0) might be associated with giftedness. It is true that all but two pupils had at least a weighted value total of at least two. Beyond that, few generalizations are safe except to note that (apparently) the "best" TC raw score to have was in the 12-17 range where nine of ten pupils made the WISC-R criterion score! Of the ten highest TC scorers (30-32), only five were recommended for gifted programming after Stage II.

Thus we arrived at the same conclusion as we had during the Teacher Checklist review. We needed to look at the Peer Nomination form and not assuming that it was being "misused" by teachers to whom it had not been correctly explained. Again, after consultation, a revised, more readable, more relevant, easier to score form was developed. It appears in the 1987 guide for teachers as "Which Two Classmates...?" and is appended to this report.

Its results, along with those from the revised Teacher Checklist, will be carefully studied next year.

Table 10: Teacher Checklist (TC) and Peer Nomination (PN) Raw (and Weighted) scores of students who proceeded to Stage II screening, 1986-87

Area A
N=20

TC RAW SCORE WEIGHT	< 9	9 - 12	13 - 16	17 - 20	> 20
> 29			*32(2);13(1) 30(2);16(1)	31(2);18(2) *30(2);20(2)	*31(2);46(2) *31(2);21(2)
24-29	28(2);2		*29(2);14(1)	25(2);18(2)	29(2);31(2) 28(2);28(2) 27(2);24(1) 27(2);21(2) 25(2);41(2)
18-23	21(2);8 *20;1	18(1);12(2)	18(2);14(2)	19(2);17(2)	18(2);31(2)
12-17					
< 12					

PN RAW SCORE (WEIGHT)

*Nominated for the Gifted Program after Stage II testing.

(TC score is given first. Hence, in "31(2);46(2)" the TC raw score is 31 and was given a weight of 2 and the PN raw score of 46 was given a weight of 2 by the teacher.)

Table 11: Teacher Checklist (TC) and Peer Nomination (PN) Raw (and Weighted) scores of students who proceeded to Stage II screening, 1986-87

Area E
N=83

TC RAW SCORE (WEIGHT)	< 9	9 - 12	13 - 16	17 - 20	> 20
>29	*32(2);4 30(2);5	*32(2);11(1) 32(2);9	*32(2);15(2) 31(2);15(1)	*32(2);17(1) 30(2);19(2) 30(2);17(2)	*32(2);24(2)
24-29	29(1);9 27(2);7 26(2);7 24(2);7 24(2);6	*25(2);12(1) *24(2);12(1)	*29(2);16(2) 28(2);16(2) 27(2);14(2) 27(2);13(2) 26(2);16(2) *25(2);13(2)	*29(2);18(2) 29(2);17(2) *28(2);19(2) *26(2);20(2) *25(2);17(2) 24(2);17(2) *24(2);17(2) 24(1);19(2)	29(2);51(2) *25(2);34(2) *29(2);34(1) 25(2);21(2) 28(2);53(2) *24(2);23(2) *28(2);42(2) *24(1);31(2) *28(2);29(2) 27(2);53(2) *27(2);43(2)
18-23	*22(2);7(1) 18(1);4 20(1);7 20(1);5 19(2);7 *19(2);6 *19(1);7 *18(2);11(1)		22(2);14(1) 21(2);16(2) 21(2);15(1) 14(2);16(2) *13(1);16(1)	22(1);17(2) *19(2);17(2) 18(2);18(2)	*23(2);28(2) 18(2);30(2) 23(2);25(2) *23(2);24(2) *22(2);34(2) 22(1);25(2) *21(2);47(2) *19(2);37(2)
12-17	*16(1);9 *12(1);7(1)		*17(1);15(1) *14(1);14(1) *13(1);16(1) *12(1);16(1)		*16(2);23(2) *15(2);27(2) 14(2);35(2) *12(2);40(2)
<12	11;8 11(1);4 9(1);8 *8;7 2;12(1) 0;2		7(2);14(2)		

PN RAW SCORE (WEIGHT)

*Nominated for the Gifted Program after Stage II testing.

(TC score is given first. Hence, in "32(2); 24(2)" the TC raw score is 32 and was given a weight of 2 by the teacher; the PN raw score of 24 was given a weight of 2 by the teacher.)

Recommendations for future action

In order to maintain and improve upon the current levels of effectiveness and efficiency in the screening processes, the following are recommended:

(1) Authorize the use of the revised "Guideline for Teachers and Principals," Identification of Gifted Programs, 1987.

(2) Repeat the Fall workshops to train new Grade 3 teachers and principals in administration of the Stage I screening program. Extend the invitation to other Grade 3 teachers, including those trained last year, to become acquained with the substantial changes in the guideline booklet e.g., in the TC and PN forms and scoring procedures. At the workshops, solicit reactions to the changes especially from teachers who used the previous forms and scoring procedures.

(3) Review all 1987-88 class record forms for completeness and accuracy and, once again, involve teachers in making corrections or completing the data. Compare 1988 and 1987 teachers' performance in order to determine whether the omission and error rates are declining. Make corrections and additions to the data before the Stage II screening begins. Flag any score sets which suggest inconsistency in the administration or scoring of any one testing or rating activity.

(4) Add 1988 data to the present tabulation of "Indicators of Effectiveness and Efficiency" (Table 1, p. 7 of this report) and calculate the annual change: explore any significant change and any failure to continue to reduce the inefficiency ratio.

(5) Examine male and female Stage I and Stage II performance data to determine whether the previously noted by-sex variances remain rather as in 1985-87 or whether there is any significant change. Discussions of the data from the 1985-86 and 1986-87 screenings need not be deferred until

then, but it may be wise to look at the 1987-88 results before deciding which, if any, of the questions raised (on pp. 11-12) in this report we want to address.

(6) The French Immersion pupil data should be reviewed to see whether the 1986-87 relationships continue. These findings indicated that RSPM score of 40 or more plus "good" TC and PN ratings is a good predictor of giftedness in at least two of three cases, while any RSPM score of below 40 or a much higher RSPM unsupported by "good" TC and PN ratings consistently indicates less than gifted ability.

(7)) The 1987-88 gifted sibling data should be reviewed as were the 1986-87. Special attention should be paid to the fate of female pupils and also those with "lower" RSPM scores.

APPENDIX A

TEACHER CHECKLIST

(Screening Device for Gifted Pupils)

Pupil's Name _____

CHECK THOSE CHARACTERISTICS WHICH THE ABOVE PUPIL DEMONSTRATES ON A RELATIVELY CONSISTENT BASIS	
1. Is a keen and alert observer; 'sees more' or 'gets more' out of a story, film, etc. than others.	
2. Has an unusually good memory and can retain a variety of information.	
3. Has unusually advanced vocabulary for age or grade level; uses terms in a 'meaningful' way.	
4. Chooses material to read which is above grade level and is able to understand it.	
5. Is able to understand complex concepts; reasons things out; sees logical and common sense answers.	
6. Becomes totally engrossed in an activity. (i.e. solving a game puzzle, building a toy model, reading a book)	
7. Is easily bored with routine tasks.	
8. Prefers to work independently; requires little direction from teacher.	
9. Displays a great deal of curiosity about many things; is constantly asking questions about anything and everything.	
10. Has original ideas or solutions to problems and questions; offers unusual, unique, clever responses.	
11. Displays a keen sense of humour and sees humour in situations that may not appear humourous to others.	
12. Is nonconforming; is individualistic; does not fear being different.	
13. Communicates verbally in a highly effective manner.	
14. Carries responsibility well; will complete work that is promised.	
15. Is self confident with other children and adults.	
16. Tends to dominate others when they are around; generally directs a group activity.	
Total =	

APPENDIX B

PEER NOMINATION FORM

WHICH TWO CLASSMATES....?

1. Imagine that your class will take part in a contest. This contest involves answering very difficult questions and solving problems. Which two classmates would you choose to represent your class?

   1. _____

   2. _____

2. Imagine that you are having trouble understanding some work assigned by your teacher. Which two classmates would you ask to help explain the assignment to you?

   1. _____

   2. _____

3. If you had a problem about how or where to find some information to do a project, which two classmates would be the best at helping you?

   1. _____

   2. _____

4. When you are learning and talking about things in class, which two classmates have the most interesting ideas and questions?

   1. _____

   2. _____

07/87